

REMARKS

Claims 1, 21, 27, 33 and 36 have been amended. Claims 1-59 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Specification Objection:

The Examiner objected to the specification as lacking the phrase “computer readable medium” used in claims 21 and 27. Claims 21 and 27 have been amended to match the terminology used in the specification. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 and 33-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claims 1-11 and 48-51, and claims 12-20 and 41-47, the Examiner asserts, “Applicants present an unreasonable number of claims which are repetitious and multiplied, the net result of which is to confuse rather than to clarify” citing 37 CFR 1.75(b) and MPEP 2173.05(n)). The Examiner has further stated that “Applicants’ reply **must include a selection** of claims for purpose of examination” (emphasis by Examiner, Office Action, p. 4) and has divided Applicants’ claims into various sets. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Applicants must select between claims 1-11 and 48-51 as well as between claims 12-20 and claims 41-47.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and assert that Applicants’ claims are not unduly multiplied or repetitious. Further, Applicants’ claims do not “confuse rather than clarify” as asserted by the Examiner. In response to the request to select between claims 1-11 and 48-51, Applicants select claims 1-11 with traverse. In response

to the request to select between claims 12-20 and 41-47, Applicants select claims 12-20 with traverse.

In regard to claims 1-11 and 48-51, Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection per a telephone interview with the Examiner on January 28, 2009. As discussed during the telephone interview, amended claims 1-11 and claims 48-51 are clearly not repetitious. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In regard to claims 12-20 and 41-47, Applicants note that claim 12 recites a “source resource containing a first set of user accounts from which a set of users are discoverable,” whereas claim 41 recites a “resource containing information objects defining at least one user from a set of users.” Thus, the resource of claim 41 is not necessarily a source resource as in claim 12, and the information objects of claim 41 are not necessarily user accounts as in claim 12. Moreover, claim 12 refers to discovering a set of users based on the set of user accounts, whereas claim 41 refers to discovering information objects. Thus, these claims are not merely repetitious of one another. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 1, the Examiner also asserts that the use of the phrase “an additional resource” is unclear. The Examiner raises a similar concern in regard to claims 33 and 36. These claims have been amended to address the Examiner’s concerns and as discussed in the telephone interview of January 28, 2009. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-96801/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 28, 2009